

App. No. 10/788,989
Amendment Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-18 and 20-23 were pending in this application before submission of this paper. The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a). Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 12, 16 and 18 are amended. Claims 2, 3, 10, 11, 13 and 20-23 are cancelled. Claims 24-31 are newly added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4, 6-9, 12, 14, 16-18 and 24-31 are currently pending in this application. In view of the amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims are respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9-14, 16, 18 and 20-23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0198455 ("Deeds") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,094,565 issued to *Alberth*. The Office Action further rejected Claims 8 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Deeds* in view of *Alberth* and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0164862 ("Cadiz"). In view of the amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a "method for using a color scheme to communicate information associated with an event and related to the integration of hardware and software in a computing device, comprising: receiving an event at the computing device, the event corresponding to a software element that has an associated color scheme, wherein the software element is associated with a user interface display of the computing device; determining a color value associated with the event, the color value corresponding to the color scheme of the software element, wherein a change to the color scheme of the software element results in a change in the color value; and illuminating the software element on the user interface display and a corresponding hardware button on the computing device according to the color value when the event is received to indicate the integration of the function of the hardware button with the software element such that the information associated with the event is communicated to a user."

Deeds teaches controlling the operation of light emitting elements of a mobile communications terminal based on a predefined color scheme associated with a predefined entry of a listing. The light emitting elements illuminate a portion of the terminal such that a user can identify the predefined entry based on the color scheme illuminating the terminal. *Alberth*

App. No. 10/788,989
Amendment Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

teaches a controller that controls an indicator to flash intermittently according to a distinctive flashing pattern. *Cadiz* teaches automatically changing the color of graphically displayed tickets over time in order to unobtrusively alert a user as to changing information or communications state or status.

Neither *Deeds*, *Alberth*, *Cadiz* nor any combination thereof teach the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 1. Specifically, neither *Deeds*, *Alberth*, *Cadiz* nor any combination thereof teach "determining a color value associated with the event, the color value corresponding to the color scheme of the software element, wherein a change to the color scheme of the software element results in a change in the color value; and illuminating the software element on the user interface display and a corresponding hardware button on the computing device according to the color value when the event is received to indicate the integration of the function of the hardware button with the software element such that the information associated with the event is communicated to a user." Therefore, the cited prior art (*Deeds*, *Alberth*, and *Cadiz*), either alone or in combination, do not anticipate or make obvious Applicants' Claim 1. Applicants submit that Claim 1, as amended, is proposed to be allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 9 and 18 include substantially the same limitations discussed above in regard to independent Claim 1. As stated above, Claim 1 is proposed to be allowable. Therefore, independent Claims 9 and 18 are proposed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as independent Claim 1, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 4, as amended, recites "the software element is a soft key." As discussed above with reference to Claim 1, none of the cited prior art references alone or in combination teach the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 4. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 4, as amended, is proposed to be allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 12 and 24 include substantially the same limitations discussed above in regard to Claim 4. As stated above, Claim 4 is proposed to be allowable. Therefore, Claims 12 and 24 are proposed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 4, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 7, as amended, recites "the event is an incoming call from a member of a user-selected group of callers." As discussed above with reference to Claim 1, none of the cited prior

App. No. 10/788,989
Amendment Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

art references alone or in combination teach the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 7. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 7, as amended, is proposed to be allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 16 and 25 include substantially the same limitations discussed above in regard to Claim 7. As stated above, Claim 7 is proposed to be allowable. Therefore, Claims 16 and 25 are proposed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 7, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 26, as amended, recites "the event is a guide for user action." As discussed above with reference to Claim 1, none of the cited prior art references alone or in combination teach the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 26. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 26, as amended, is proposed to be allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 27 and 28 include substantially the same limitations discussed above in regard to Claim 26. As stated above, Claim 26 is proposed to be allowable. Therefore, Claims 27 and 28 are proposed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 26, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claim 29, as amended, recites "the event is a calendar reminder." As discussed above with reference to Claim 1, none of the cited prior art references alone or in combination teach the limitations recited in Applicants' Claim 29. Therefore, Applicants submit that Claim 29, as amended, is proposed to be allowable and notice to that effect is solicited.

Claims 30 and 31 include substantially the same limitations discussed above in regard to Claim 29. As stated above, Claim 29 is proposed to be allowable. Therefore, Claims 30 and 31 are proposed to be allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 29, and notice to that effect is solicited.

Furthermore, Claims 4, 6-8, 12, 14, 16, 17 and 24-31 are dependent on allowable base claims and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that Claims 1, 9 and 18 are allowable.

App. No. 10/788,989
Amendment Dated December 7, 2005
Reply to Office Action of November 2, 2005

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



John J. Farrell
Registration No. 57,291
Direct Dial: 206.342.6261

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200
[JJF/ab]

